

Docket No. 740116-498  
Serial No. 10/727,562  
Page 7

### REMARKS

By the above actions, the specification and claims 1 and 19-21 have been amended. Additionally, appended to this response is a set of replacement drawings containing a new Fig. 5. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is now requested.

The Examiner's indication of allowability with respect to claims 6-9, 11-17 and 20 has been noted with appreciation. However, since claim 1 from which these claims depend is also believed to be patentable, no action is being taken at this time to place these claims in condition for allowance.

In response to the objection to the drawings, a new Fig. 5 has been presented in the replacement drawings. This new figure shows a single-stage gearing in which the drive motor 12 is equipped with a worm 15 which directly engages the actuating element 13, the worm 15 having a blocking surface 15a that comes into blocking contact with the ratchet 2 when the ratchet 2 reaches the raised position. The specification has been amended to reference the new figure and the figure number 15a. From a comparison of new Figure 5 with original Figure 1 and the description found in the language of the specification and claims 9 & 10 as originally filed, it should be clear that new Figure 5 contains no new matter. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is now in order and is hereby requested.

Claims 19 & 20 were objected to and it was required that the word "is" be inserted before the word "coupled." This correction has been rendered unnecessary due to the amendments made to conform these claims with paragraph [0050] to which subject matter these claims are directed. As a result, this objection should now be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 21, & 22 were rejected under 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite. With regard to claim 10, it appears that this rejection is related to the drawing objection based on this claim. Thus, presumably, the presentation of new Figure 5 will obviate the rejection of claim 10.

Concerning claim 21, the above amendment corrects the error in referring to movement of the actuating element instead of the operating element (which is the ratchet 2) clarifies the difference between raising the ratchet by the drive, on the one hand, and locking the drive by the ratchet, on the other hand.

Docket No. 740116-498

Serial No. 10/727,562

Page 8

As a result of reformatting claim 22 and other amendments, claim 22 is now believed to be clear and definite.

In view of the noted actions, the § 112 rejection should now be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 18, 19, 21, & 22 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by the Ehret patent. This rejection is inappropriate, at least insofar as it relates to the claims as now presented for the following reasons.

As noted in paragraph nos. [0005] and [0006]:

An object of the present invention is directed to a motor vehicle door lock that has a reduced striking noise associated with a blocking operation of the drive as well as a reduced tendency to jam.

One way in which the aforementioned object is achieved is through use of the motor vehicle door lock of the present invention. A door lock with latching elements such as a latch and ratchet with a lock mechanism is provided. The lock mechanism has a drive that includes a drive motor, or the like, and an actuating element. The ratchet can be raised by the drive, and the ratchet thus moves into an action area of the drive so that the ratchet can block further movement of the drive. Thus, the movement of the ratchet can turn off the drive in a block operation. The ratchet, viewed in a "kinematic chain" from the drive motor to the actuating element, engages the drive to block in front of the actuating element and not on the actuating element itself (without directly engaging the actuating element). The engagement point of the ratchet in the kinematic chain has the advantage that the blocking, which is necessary for blocking operation, takes place at the point at which the active torque is comparatively low. Thus, this results in a reduced striking noise as well as a reduced tendency to jam.

Thus, on the one hand, the drive raises the ratchet, and on the other hand, once raised, the ratchet serves as the means for blocking the drive without actually engaging the actuating element via which it is raised. Furthermore, as indicated, this arrangement has the dual benefits of both reducing striking noise and the tendency to jam.

In contrast, Ehret discloses an arrangement in which a separate blocking lever 48 has a stop 50 which interacts with the detent pawl (ratchet) 18 and which serves to block the driving pin 44 (see abstract, col. 3, lines 58-61 and claim 1). Thus, Ehret discloses a fundamentally different construction from that of the present invention, having a separate blocking lever that has no counterpart in present invention. As a result, Ehret's disclosure cannot anticipate the subject matter of the present claims which define applicants' structure

Docket No. 740116-498

Serial No. 10/727,562

Page 9

which obtains the noted benefits in the manner described. Therefore, the outstanding rejection based upon the Ehret patent should be withdrawn and such action is requested.

The references that have been cited but not applied by the Examiner have been taken into consideration. However, since these references were not found to be relevant enough by the Examiner to apply against the original claims, no detailed comments thereon are believed to be warranted at this time.

While this application should now be in condition for allowance, in the event that any issues should remain after consideration of this response which could be addressed through discussions with the undersigned, then the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone for that purpose. In this regard, the Examiner's attention is directed to the new correspondence address and telephone number indicated below and on the accompanying Change of Address notice.

Respectfully submitted,



David S. Safran  
Registration No. 27,997

Customer No. 25570  
Roberts Mlotkowski & Hobbes P.C  
8270 Greensboro Drive  
Suite 850  
McLean, VA 22102

Direct Telephone: (703) 584-3273

DSS:kmm